

REMARKS

The Office Action dated February 6, 2007 has been received and considered. In this response, claims 2, 5, 8, 9, 11, 13-16, 20, 22, 26-28, 31, and 33 have been amended to correct various informalities and to improve consistency among the claims and claim 32 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Anticipated Rejection of Claims 1-33

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kikinis (U.S. Patent No. 5,532,719). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites the features of “receiving, at a device driver, a first display information for a video image, the display information indicating a portion of the video image to be displayed in a first window of a first monitor” and “determining a first aspect ratio of the video image based on the first display information at the device driver.” The Office asserts that the adjustment circuitry 52 of FIG. 1 of Kikinis and the corresponding passage at col. 2, lines 47-51 disclose these features. *Office Action*, p. 2. Contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, Kikinis fails to disclose or suggest these claim features. To wit, Kikinis addresses aspect ratios only at the passage cited by the Office Action. In full, this passage states: “Adjustments may be made for brightness, contrast, position and size, including aspect ratio, for the display. Commands may also be sent to switch video modes and to signal the monitor to assume alternative power-using states.” Thus, the relied-upon passage of Kikinis merely states that an aspect ratio can be adjusted for a display; this passage fails to disclose, or even suggest, that an aspect ratio is determined based on display information indicating a portion of the video image to be displayed in a first window of a first monitor as provided by claim 1. Accordingly, Kikinis fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by claim 1.

Independent claim 17 recites the features of “determining, at a device driver, a first aspect ratio of a video image to be at least partially displayed in a first window of a first monitor” and

“determining, based on the first aspect ratio, a first display location of a second monitor for the video image.” The Office provides no specific rationale for the rejection of claim 17 other than referencing the rejection of claims 1-16. The Office asserts that “the system of Kikinis is intended to use [sic] for more than one monitor.” However, contrary to this assertion, no such teaching can be found in Kikinis and the Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Office particularly identify a passage of Kikinis in support of this assertion. As such, Kikinis fails to disclose or suggest its use with two or more monitors. Further, even Kikinis were to be erroneously interpreted to be intended for use with two or more monitors, Kikinis fails to disclose or suggest how the first aspect ratio of a video image at least partially displayed in a first window of a first monitor would be used to determine a first display location of a second monitor for the video image as provided by claim 17. Accordingly, Kikinis fails to disclose or even suggest each and every feature recited by claim 17.

Independent claim 31 recites the features of “a first module to access a first information in a device driver to determine a first display area of a video image to be displayed in a first window of a first monitor” and “a second module to determine, based on the first information, a first display location of a second monitor for the video image.” As noted above, Kikinis fails to disclose or suggest a second monitor. Further, Kikinis fails to disclose or suggest determining a first display location of a second monitor for a video image based on a first information as provided by claim 31. Accordingly, Kikinis fails to disclose or even suggest each and every feature recited by claim 31.

Independent claim 33 recites the features of “a first module to determine a first aspect ratio of a video image to be displayed in a first window of a first monitor” and “a second module to determine, based on the first aspect ratio, a first display location of a second monitor for the video image.” As noted above, Kikinis fails to disclose or suggest a second monitor. Further, as similarly discussed with respect to claim 17, Kikinis fails to disclose or suggest determining a first display location of a second monitor for a video image based on a first aspect ratio of a video image to be displayed in a first window of a first monitor as provided by claim 33. Accordingly, Kikinis fails to disclose or even suggest each and every feature recited by claim 33.

Kikinis also fails to disclose or suggest the particular combinations of features recited by claims 2-16 and 18-30 at least by virtue of their dependency from one of claims 1 or 17. Moreover, these dependent claims recite additional novel features. For example, claim 16 recites the additional features of “providing the portion of the video image for display in the first window [of the first monitor]” and “providing the video image for display in the first display location [of the second monitor.” Kikinis fails to disclose or suggest providing a video image for display at two monitors and therefore fails to disclose or suggest the features of claim 16.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the anticipation rejection of claims 1-33 is improper at this time. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this anticipation rejection therefore is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Applicants believe no additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ryan S. Davidson/

Ryan S. Davidson, Reg. No. 51,596
LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP
5914 W. Courtyard Dr., Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78730
(512) 439-7100 (phone)
(512) 439-7199 (fax)

28 March 2007

Date